

**REMARKS**

Claims 20-23 and 32-39 are pending in the application, with claims 20 and 32 being the independent claims. Claims 24-31 are withdrawn from consideration as a result of the restriction requirement. Claims 36-39 are sought to be added. Entry and consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. No new matter is believed to have been introduced by this amendment.

Applicant has made the above Amendment to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding objections and rejections.

***Objections to the Claims***

Claims 20-23 and 32-35 are objected to because of informalities. Applicant has amended these claims as suggested by the Examiner to overcome the objection to the claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objections to the claims be reconsidered and withdrawn.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)***

Claims 20, 22 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,208,637 (hereinafter referred to as “the Eames patent”). Claims 21 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over the Eames patent as applied to independent claim 20 and further in view of U.S. Patent No.

6,347,075 (hereinafter referred to as the Barzegar patent"). Claims 23 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over the Eames patent as applied to independent claim 20 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,061,450 (hereinafter referred to as the Bauer patent"). Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over the Eames patent as applied to independent claim 20 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,118,768 (hereinafter referred to as the Bhatia patent"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections since the Eames, Barzegar, Bauer and Bhatia patents, either taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each element of amended independent claims 20 and 32 for at least the following reasons.

Independent claims 20 and 32 have been amended to include a memory device to store one or more telephone numbers that are to be serviced by the broadband telephony adapter, wherein the device controller separates information associated with the one or more telephone numbers, and wherein the one or more telephone numbers are associated with the one or more telephony devices. The Eames, Barzegar, Bauer and/or Bhatia patents, either taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest a memory device to store one or more telephone numbers that are to be serviced by the broadband telephony adapter, wherein the device controller separates information associated with the one or more telephone numbers, and wherein the one or more telephone numbers are associated with the one or more telephony devices. Therefore, for at least this reason, independent claims 20 and 32 (and their dependent claims 21-23 and 33-35) are patentable over the Eames, Barzegar, Bauer and Bhatia patents, either taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**New claims 36-39**

New claims 36-39 are patentable over the Eames, Barzegar, Bauer and Bhatia patents, either taken alone or in combination, for at least the same reasons as the claims from which they depend.

Appln. Serial No. 09/469,987  
Reply to non-final Office Action mailed on July 9, 2004

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed accommodated or rendered moot. Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action. Thus, Applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance, and as such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, and allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation



Molly A. McCall  
Patent Attorney  
Intel Americas, Inc.  
Registration No. 46,126  
(703) 633-3311

Dated: September 28, 2004

P7612 Reply to Nonfinal OA

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 100, Alexandria, VA 22313 on:

28 SEPTEMBER 2004  
Date of Deposit

DEBORAH L. HIGMAN  
Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

[Signature] 9-28-04  
Signature Date